

Westfield-Washington Advisory Plan Commission held a meeting on Monday, November 7, 2011 scheduled for 7:00 PM at the Westfield City Hall.

**Opening of Meeting: 7:00 PM**

**Roll Call:** Note Presence of a Quorum

**Commission Members Present:** Robert Smith, Cindy Spoljaric, Pete Emigh, Dan Degnan, Steve Hoover, Robert Horkay, and Bill Sanders.

**City Staff Present:** Matt Skelton, Director; Kevin Todd, Senior Planner; Ryan Clark, Planner; Sarah Reed, Planner; and Brian Zaiger, City Attorney

**Approval of the Minutes:**

Motion to approve the October 17, 2011 minutes as presented.

Motion: Hoover; Second: Spoljaric; Vote: Passed by Voice Vote

**2012 Advisory Plan Commission Calendar:**

Motion to approve the 2012 APC Schedule as presented.

Motion: Emigh; Second: Horkay; Vote: Passed by Voice Vote

Todd reviewed the Advisory Plan Commission Rules of Procedure.

**ITEMS OF BUSINESS**

Case No.	1111-PUD-05
Petitioner	Mainstreet Property Group, LLC
Description	<b>Mainstreet at Grand Park PUD</b>
	700 feet west of the Intersection of Tomlinson Road and Blackburn Road
	Petitioner requests a change in zoning from the OI-PD District to Mainstreet at Grand
	Park PUD District on approximately 7 acres.

Skelton reviewed the petition stating that the public hearing was held at the last meeting. He reviewed the modified items, including the preservation of trees in the form of a conservation easement and the intent of the petitioner to purchase the property immediately east. He stated that in the event the petitioner purchases that property, they would be relieved, as proposed, from installing the buffer in on the east side of the site. He further stated that if they do not purchase the property, the petitioner will have to comply with the buffer requirements in the zoning ordinance.

Motion: To send 1111-PUD-05 to the Westfield City Council with a positive recommendation.

Motion: Emigh; Second: Horkay; Vote: 7-0

1 Case No. 1110-ZOA-04  
2 Petitioner City of Westfield  
3 Description **Sign Ordinance Amendment**  
4 Petitioner is requesting amendments to sections WC 16.08.010 (Sign Standards) and WC  
5 16.04.210 (Definitions) of the Westfield-Washington Township Zoning Ordinance.  
6

7 Todd stated that there were no changes made since the last meeting and there were no comments  
8 at the public hearing regarding the proposed sign ordinance amendment.  
9

10 Motion: To send 1111-PUD-05 to the Westfield City Council with a positive  
11 recommendation.  
12

13 Motion: Emigh; Second: Hoover; Vote: 7-0  
14  
15

16 Case No. 1111-PUD-06  
17 Petitioner Epiphany Evangelical Lutheran Church  
18 Description **Centennial North PUD Amendment**  
19 Petitioner requests an amendment to the Centennial North PUD, modifying certain  
20 development standards and permitted uses.  
21

22 Clark introduced the petition, stating that this is a proposal to amend the Centennial North PUD to  
23 accommodate institutional uses as a permitted use. He added that no changes are being proposed to the  
24 residential development or architectural standards that are already in place.  
25

26 Mr. Tom Engle, representing Epiphany Evangelical Lutheran Church, discussed the proposal, stating that  
27 they have not hired an architect yet so there are no specific designs at this point.  
28

29 A Public Hearing opened at 7:17 p.m.  
30

31 Mr. Joe Plankis, representing the Centennial HOA Board, stated that the Board has no objection to this  
32 development; however, the Board would request that the Commission and staff look at making sure there  
33 is adequate land set aside with this development to provide for a round-about at 156<sup>th</sup> Street and Ditch.  
34

35 Mr. Charles Davis, representing his mother who is the property owner directly across the road to the west,  
36 stated that there are drainage problems in that area and would like to work with the church to resolve  
37 these drainage issues.  
38

39 The Public Hearing closed at 7:20 p.m.  
40

41 Spoljaric asked for an explanation on how this does or does not affect the total number of residential  
42 dwelling units, density, and open space.  
43

44 Clark explained that the proposal is to subtract the land for an institutional use when calculating density  
45 and open space. He further clarified, stating that if 10 acres is used for the church, the density would be  
46 calculated based on 108 acres (noting that the whole Centennial North property is 118 acres); so the total  
47 units would be adjusted accordingly. He added open space is calculated the same way.  
48

1 Hoover asked about the landscape buffering plan, specifically regarding Type A and Type B buffers. He  
2 asked for clarification as to how these buffers applied to the church, depending on the church's location.

3  
4 Clark responded that if the church is in the proposed location, then Type B buffer would apply. He added  
5 that if the church was moved further north, then the Type A buffer may apply to its northern boundary.

6  
7 Sanders expressed concern about the building height of 65 feet, since the nature of the building height is  
8 unknown according to this proposal.

9  
10 Engle responded that he is not sure exactly where that number came from, but the idea is since the  
11 petitioner does not know how high, they wanted to make it enough so they do not have to come back for a  
12 variance.

13  
14 Skelton stated they will get this resolved before the petition appears before the Commission in two weeks.

15  
16  
17 Case No. 1111-DP-06 & 1111-SPP-02

18 Petitioner Stoepelworth & Associates

19 Description **Bridgewater, Parcels G6, G7, K3 & L2**

20 Petitioner requests a Development Plan Review and a Primary Plat Review for 77 lots on  
21 approximately 92 acres in Parcels G6, G7, K3 & L2 of the Bridgewater PUD

22  
23 Skelton recapped the function of the Commission when considering development plan petitions.

24  
25 Reed introduced the petition, which is a request for development plan review for parcels G6, G7 and K3  
26 for residential purposes. She stated these parcels will follow the normal development plan review  
27 process. She further stated parcel L2 is only going through the primary plat review process at this time.  
28 She added the petitioner will make the necessary revisions addressed in the staff report and will before the  
29 Commission again on November 21.

30  
31 Mr. John Dobosiewicz shared some additional details regarding the petition, stating G6 and G7 have not  
32 been before the Commission previously. He stated the area north of Brentwood Subdivision will be  
33 single family detached lots rather than originally contemplated as townhomes. He also discussed  
34 landscaping provisions and access to the development.

35  
36 A Public Hearing opened at 7:37 p.m.

37  
38 Mr. Robert Staley, representing Setters Run HOA, stated they have no problems with the development,  
39 but expressed concern regarding the increase in traffic along Setters Road and the safety of children  
40 playing at the playground and going to the pool.

41  
42 Ms. Jackie Beck, adjacent to the property on Setters Road, expressed concern about the new development  
43 of storage units to the east have not been given a left right-of-way so Setters Run is the first community  
44 through street for drivers to turn around to head east.

45  
46 The Public Hearing closed at 7:41 p.m.

47  
48 Skelton responded these comments will be communicated to the Westfield Public Works Department to  
49 address.

50

**ADJOURNMENT** (7:45 p.m.)

---

President, Robert Smith, Esq.

---

Vice President, Cindy Spoljaric

---

Secretary, Matthew S. Skelton, Esq.

DRAFT